MASB
MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION
OF SCHOOL BOARDS

SUPERINTENDENT
EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

/MISchoolBoards /company/mischoolboards @MASB

Revised December 2025

Introduction

The Revised School Code requires school boards to evaluate their superintendent's job performance annually as part of a comprehensive performance evaluation system that takes into account student growth and assessment data. MASB is pleased to provide this superintendent evaluation instrument based on the requirements of the Revised School Code. The instrument provides school districts a straightforward option for superintendent evaluation. It may be used alone or in conjunction with a facilitated evaluation.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

This evaluation instrument is based in part on two bodies of research: *The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders,* which were reviewed and published by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 2015 and *School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement* which was conducted by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) in 2006. For detailed information on the research base, please consult the appendixes of this document.

Requirements, Process, Timeline and Resources

Please consult the appendixes of this document for considerable supplementary information and guidance on superintendent evaluation.

Scoring

MASB recommends scoring on the rubric be limited to whole numbers (1, 2, 3) and half numbers (1.5, 2.5). Scoring in lesser increments undermines the reliability of the evaluation instrument.

Training

The Revised School Code requires Board of Education members to receive training on the evaluation instrument to be used for the superintendent and rater reliability training. Training must also be provided to the superintendent regarding the measures used in the evaluation system and how each measure will be used.

Posting Requirements

Districts must post comprehensive information on their websites in regards to the evaluation instrument being used. For details in regards to the MASB Superintendent Evaluation instrument's posting requirements, please visit **masb.org/postingrequirements.**

Who to Contact

Topic	Contact	
Superintendent Evaluation	**517.327.5928**	**search@masb.org**
Training on Superintendent Evaluation	**517.327.5904**	**leadershipservices@masb.org**
Legal Questions	**517.327.5929**	**legal@masb.org**
Facilitated Evaluation	**517.327.5904**	**leadershipservices@masb.org**

Table of Contents

A. Governance & Board Relations....4
B. Community Relations....6
C. Staff Relations....8
D. Business & Finance....10
E. Instructional Leadership....12
F. Determining the Professional Practice Rating....14
G. Other Required Components of Evaluation....15
Student Growth 15
Progress Toward District-Wide Goals 15
H. Compiling the Summative Evaluation Score....16

Appendix A – *Research Base* 17
Appendix B – *Process for Completing Year-End Evaluation for Superintendent* 18
Appendix C – *Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference* 19
Appendix D – *Considerations Related to the Closed Meeting Exception* 20
Appendix E – *Possible Timelines for Evaluation of the Superintendent* 21
Appendix F – *Establishing Performance Goals for the Superintendent* 22
Appendix G – *Evidence* 23
Appendix H – *Possible Evidence of Performance* 24
Appendix I – *Contingencies* 26
Appendix J – *Student Growth and Assessment Data or Student Learning Objectives Metrics* 27
Appendix K – *Developing an Individual Improvement Plan for the Superintendent* 28
Appendix L – *Training* 29

Authors....30

A. Governance & Board Relations

Weight: 20%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
A1	**Policy Involvement** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9	Makes decisions without regard to adopted policy.	Provides correspondence from policy provider with recommendation(s) for adoption. Follows as written.	Is actively involved in the development, recommendation and administration of district policies.	
A2	**Goal Development** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9, 10	Goals are not developed.	Goals are defined by implementing state curriculum and seeking to maximize student scores.	Facilitates the development of short-term goals for the district and reports goal progress to board. Provides the necessary financial strategies to meet those goals. Budget practices help to ensure alignment of resources to goals.	
A3	**Information** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Does not provide the information the board needs to perform its responsibilities.	Keeps only some members informed, making it difficult for the board to perform its responsibilities.	Has established mutually agreed upon protocols that consistently keeps all board members informed with appropriate information as needed so the Board may perform its responsibilities.	
A4	**Materials and Background** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 7, 9	Meeting materials aren't readily available. Members arrive at meetings without enough prior information regarding agenda or background information.	Meeting materials are incomplete, and don't include adequate background information or historical perspective.	Meeting materials are provided with adequate background and historical perspective included. Recommendations are well thought out.	
A5	**Board Questions** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Board questions aren't answered fully nor in a timely manner.	Most board questions are answered. All members aren't apprised of all relevant questions/answers.	Board questions are addressed with follow-up to all board members.	
A6	**Board Development** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6	Doesn't promote and does not budget for board development.	When prompted, provides members with information about board development.	Actively encourages board development by providing board members with information regarding board development opportunities when they arise. Ensures funding is available and aligned to board development plan.	
				Category rating:	**#DIV/0!**

Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Meeting agendas/minutes
- Board packets
- Board development materials
- Memos/communications
- Board policies/policy book
- Retreat agendas/minutes
- Board development plan
- Communication protocols

A. Governance & Board Relations, continued

Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:	**Goal:**
Evidence:	

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	**Comments by the Superintendent:**

B. Community Relations

Weight: 15%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
B1	**Communication With Community/Parents** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Isn't readily available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups. Avoids direct communication unless absolutely necessary.	Is available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups, providing them with information, but doesn't engage. Is not proactive with communication.	Actively seeks two-way communication with the community and parents as appropriate.	
B2	**Community/Parent Input** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Doesn't accept input or engage community/parents.	Accepts input from community/parents, but fails to seek it. Does not engage community/parents in consideration of decisions or goal setting.	Actively seeks community/parent input and engages community/parents in goal setting and decision-making.	
B3	**Media Relations** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Communicates with the media only when requested.	Isn't proactive, but is cooperative with the media when contacted.	Actively engages the media to promote the district and provide timely and effective information.	
B4	**District Image** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Is indifferent or negative about the district. Does not speak well or represent the district well in front of groups.	Doesn't actively promote the district. Speaks adequately in public.	Projects a positive image at all times and is a champion for the district. Knowledgeable and speaks well for the district.	
B5	**Approachability** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Is neither visible nor approachable by members of the community.	Is not consistently visible at events or in the community. Is not consistently approachable by members of the community.	Is consistently visible at a variety of events and is approachable by members of the community.	
				Category rating:	**#DIV/0!**

Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Third party survey data
- School accreditation survey data
- Meeting invitations, agendas
- Press releases
- Community meeting agendas
- News clips/interviews
- Community engagement calendar
- Strategic planning agenda(s)
- Communications
- Service club membership(s)

B. Community Relations, continued

Weight: 15%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:	**Goal:**
Evidence:	

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	**Comments by the Superintendent:**

C. Staff Relations

Weight: 15%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
C1	**Staff Input** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 7	Doesn't accept input or engage teachers and staff in decision-making or goal setting.	Accepts suggestions and input from staff but does not seek it. Does not engage staff in district-wide goal setting or decision-making.	Actively seeks staff input and engages staff in goal setting and decision-making.	
C2	**Staff Communications** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Doesn't inform staff of matters that may be of concern.	Is inconsistent in keeping staff informed of important matters.	Consistently keeps staff informed of important matters.	
C3	**Personnel Matters** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9	Personnel matters are not handled in a consistent manner. Some situations may be handled with bias.	Many personnel matters are handled, but not always in a consistent manner.	Personnel matters are handled with consistency, fairness, discretion, and impartiality. Personnel procedures are regularly reviewed, communicated to staff, and updated as needed.	
C4	**Delegation of Duties** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9, 10	Doesn't delegate duties. Maintains too much personal control over all district operations.	Delegates duties as staff members request additional responsibilities.	Delegates responsibility to staff that will foster professional growth, leadership and decision-making skills.	
C5	**Recruitment** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6	There is no formal or informal recruitment process and/or hiring is considered in an arbitrary manner.	An informal recruitment and hiring process is in place, but is not used consistently.	A formal recruitment and hiring process is followed for each hiring opportunity. Actively recruits the best staff available and encourages their application to the district.	
C6	**Labor Relations (Bargaining)** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9	Is unable to work with union leadership, doesn't work to improve relations.	Is inconsistent in working with union leadership in regard to bargaining and labor relations.	Proactively works with union leadership to build relationships with staff groups and establishes trust and effective sharing of information in the bargaining process as appropriate.	
C7	**Visibility in District** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 4, 5, 6	Seldom visits buildings.	Is occasionally present at building programs and special activities.	Consistently visits buildings/classrooms and attends special activities.	
				Category rating:	**#DIV/0!**

Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Third-party survey data
- School accreditation survey data
- Hiring process documentation
- Personnel policies and procedures
- Recruitment calendar
- Staff leadership development plan
- Negotiations documentation
- School visit calendar
- Communications

C. Staff Relations, continued

Weight: 15%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:	**Goal:**
Evidence:	

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	**Comments by the Superintendent:**

D. Business & Finance

Weight: 20%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
D1	**Budget Development and Management** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9	Budget knowledge is limited. The budget is developed and managed without taking into consideration current needs of the district.	Works to develop and manage the budget to meet the immediate fiscal issues. Decisions are primarily reactive to current needs of the district.	Budget actions are proactive and consider the most current information and data while also planning for long-range needs. A balance is sought to meet the needs of students and remain fiscally responsible to the community.	
D2	**Budget Reports** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9	Doesn't report financial information to the board except with the annual audit.	Reports the status of financial accounts as requested by the board.	Reports to the board concerning the budget and financial status on a regular basis (monthly, quarterly, etc.) as agreed upon by governance team.	
D3	**Financial Controls** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9	Annual audit has revealed areas that are in need of improvement. Financial accounts aren't in order.	Annual audit is used to reveal any discrepancies. Internal controls are inconsistent.	Promotes appropriate financial controls, including third-party audits and reconciliation of accounts. Is up-to-date with GAAP and state accounting procedures. Maintains internal controls.	
D4	**Facility Management** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 5, 9	A facilities management plan is not created. Maintenance is only performed when absolutely needed.	Facilities needs are discussed internally, but a plan is not created. Issues are addressed on an as-needed basis.	Facilities management plan in place includes current status of buildings and the need to improve facilities in the future, with a projected plan to secure funding.	
D5	**Resource Allocation** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9	Resources are allocated inconsistently and without consideration of district needs.	Resources are allocated to meet immediate needs.	Resources are distributed consistently based upon district goals/needs and seek to meet both immediate and long-range objectives.	
				Category rating:	**#DIV/0!**

Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Strategic plan
- Auditor's report
- District budget
- Budget-related communications
- Election results that impact funding or facilities
- Evidence of budgetary alignment to district-wide goals
- Grants received/applied for
- Policies/procedures related to fund management
- Long-term financial forecast data
- Facilities maintenance plan
- Facilities management plan

D. Business & Finance, continued

Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:	**Goal:**
Evidence:	

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	**Comments by the Superintendent:**

E. Instructional Leadership

Weight: 30%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
E1	**Performance Evaluation System** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10	No performance evaluation system is in place and/or not all evaluations have been completed as required.	Most performance evaluations are completed in a timely manner and are in compliance with state law.	Performance evaluation system has been established that is in compliance with state law, provides opportunities for growth to instructional staff, and is applied consistently across the district with consistent results. Individual Development Plans are provided to staff rated as less than effective.	
E2	**Building-Level Leadership** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 6, 7	No effort is made to foster autonomy at school buildings. Expectations regarding learning and instruction have not been identified.	Little effort is made to foster autonomy at school buildings. Expectations regarding learning and instruction are vague or unclear.	Principals are provided defined autonomy consistently with accountability. Goals for learning and instruction are prioritized.	
E3	**Staff Development** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 10	Staff development isn't consistently provided. Staff members are responsible for their own improvement.	Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities.	Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities that are targeted toward staff growth and increasing student achievement.	
E4	**School Improvement (MICIP)** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10	School improvement (MICIP) efforts are limited. There is no comprehensive plan in place.	School improvement (MICIP) plans are in place at the building level but lack district-wide coordination.	School improvement (MICIP) plans are in place at all buildings and align to the district-wide goals.	
E5	**Curriculum** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 7	Curriculum isn't a priority in the district and/or is inconsistent across grade levels.	Teachers are allowed to define their own curriculum. There is little coordination.	Curriculum is in place, aligned across grade levels and in compliance with state standards.	
E6	**Instruction** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 6, 7	There is little to no focus on instruction. Technology is not utilized in classroom instruction.	Teachers are encouraged to enhance their instructional skills and embrace technology, but no comprehensive program(s) is in place.	Effort is made to accommodate diverse learning needs and levels of readiness. Technology is used to enhance teaching and learning.	
E7	**Student Voice** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5	Doesn't accept input or seek student feedback.	Accepts suggestions and input from students but does not seek it.	Seeks the student voice through engagement of students in goal development and/or decision-making.	

E. Instructional Leadership, continued

Weight: 30%

		Needing Support (1 pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
E8	**Support for Students** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5	Academic supports are in place, but are inconsistent.	Academic supports are in place but social supports to meet the needs of students are lacking.	Programs and activities are available for students. Maintains a safe, caring and healthy learning environment.	
E9	**Professional Knowledge** Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 4, 6	Is uninvolved in current instructional programs. Is unaware of current instructional issues. Does not hold appropriate superintendent certification and is not enrolled in appropriate certification program.	Is somewhat knowledgeable of current instructional programs. Relies on others for information/data. Does not hold appropriate superintendent certification but is currently enrolled in appropriate certification program.	Demonstrates knowledge of current instructional programs, and is able to discuss them. Participates actively in professional groups and organizations for the benefit of the district and personal, professional growth. Holds and maintains appropriate superintendent certification.	
				Category rating:	**#DIV/0!**

Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Staff evaluation calendar
- District performance evaluation system
- Superintendent professional growth plan
- Curriculum
- RtI/MTSS
- Superintendent professional development
- Teacher analysis of student achievement data
- Curriculum audit
- Strategic plan/district-wide goals
- Staff development plan
- Professional development calendar
- Instructional model(s)
- Documentation of instructional rounds
- Curriculum team agendas
- Instructional audit
- Coaching documentation
- Observational data from staff
- Positive behavior supports/character programs

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:	**Goal:**
Evidence:	

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	**Comments by the Superintendent:**

F. Determining the Professional Practice Rating

Superintendent Name: School Year:

Item	Weight of Category	Category Score (%)	Category Weighted Score
A. Governance & Board Relations	20% (.2)	#DIV/0! x 20%	= #DIV/0!
B. Community Relations	15% (.15)	#DIV/0! x 15%	= #DIV/0!
C. Staff Relations	15% (.15)	#DIV/0! x 15%	= #DIV/0!
D. Business & Finance	20% (.2)	#DIV/0! x 20%	= #DIV/0!
E. Instructional Leadership	30% (.3)	#DIV/0! x 30%	= #DIV/0!
Total Possible	100%	**Score:**	#DIV/0!
		Adjusted (Score / 3) =	#DIV/0!

G. Other Required Components of Evaluation

Superintendent Name: School Year:

Student Growth and Assessment Data or Student Learning Objectives Metrics

Weight: 20%

Student growth and assessment data used for superintendent evaluation may be the combined student growth and assessment data used in teacher/administrator evaluations for the entire district. Districts should establish a student growth model to be used for teacher and administrator evaluations.

	Needs Support (1pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
	Locally determined	Locally determined	Locally determined	
Growth:				
Evidence:	District Growth Model			
			Component score:	**0**

Progress Toward District-Wide Goals

Weight: 15%

Progress made by the school district in meeting the goals set forth in the school district's school improvement (MICIP) plans or district goals.

	Needs Support (1pt)	Developing (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Rating
	Progress was made on fewer than 67% of goals	Progress was made on 67-84% of goals	Progress was made on 85-100% of goals	
Progress:				
Evidence:	As indicated in District-Wide Improvement Plan or District Goals			
			Component score:	**0**

H. Compiling the Summative Evaluation Score

Component	Weight of Component	Component Score (%)	Component Weighted Score
Professional Practice (Adjusted score, pg. 14)	65% (.65)	#DIV/0! x 65%	= #DIV/0!
Student Growth (Component score, pg. 15)	20% (.20)	0 x 20%	= 0
Progress Toward District-Wide Goals (Component score, pg. 15)	15% (.15)	0 x 15%	= 0
Total Possible	100%	**Total Score:**	#DIV/0!
		Total Score / 3=	#DIV/0!

Evaluation rating as follows: 85% - 100% = Effective; 67% - 84% = Developing; Less than 67% = Needing Support

Comments by Board of Education:	Comments by the Superintendent:

Board President's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Superintendent's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Superintendent's signature indicates that he or she has seen and discussed the evaluation; it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation.)

Appendix A – *Research Base*

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA: Author.

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and American Association of School Administrators were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration, a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (2006). School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement. Denver, CO: Author.

To determine the influence of district superintendents on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, McREL, a Denver-based education research organization, conducted a meta-analysis of research—a sophisticated research technique that combines data from separate studies into a single sample of research—on the influence of school district leaders on student performance. This study is the latest in a series of meta-analyses that McREL has conducted over the past several years to determine the characteristics of effective schools, leaders and teachers. This most recent meta-analysis examines findings from 27 studies conducted since 1970 that used rigorous, quantitative methods to study the influence of school district leaders on student achievement. Altogether, these studies involved 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students, resulting in what McREL researchers believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendents.

Appendix B – *Process for Completing Year-End Evaluation for Superintendent*

Planning: At the beginning of the year in which the evaluation is to occur, the Board of Education and superintendent convene a meeting in public and agree upon the following items:

- Evaluation instrument
- Evaluation timeline and key dates
- Performance goals (if necessary beyond performance indicators outlined in rubric, district-wide improvement goals and student growth model)
- Appropriate benchmarks and checkpoints (formal and informal) throughout year
- Artifacts to be used to evidence superintendent performance
- Process for compiling the year-end evaluation
- Process and individual(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation conference with the superintendent
- Process and individual(s) responsible for establishing a performance improvement plan for the superintendent, if needed
- Process and individual(s) responsible for sharing the evaluation results with the community

Checkpoints: The Board of Education and superintendent meet at key points in the evaluation year as follows:

- **Three months in – *Informal update* –** Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- **Six months in – *Mid-Year Progress Report* – Superintendent provides update on progress along with available evidence prior to convening a meeting in public. Board president collects questions from the board and provides to superintendent prior to meeting. Board and superintendent discuss progress and make adjustments to course or goals, if needed. THIS MID-YEAR PROGRESS REPORT IS A REQUIREMENT**
- **Nine months in – *Informal update* –** Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- **11-12 months in – *Formal evaluation* –** Superintendent conducts self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education (made available prior to meeting). Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation meeting; seek clarification as needed. Board president (or consultant) facilitates evaluation. Formal evaluation is adopted by Board of Education.

Appendix C – *Conducting the Formal Evaluation & Conference*

Prior to meeting:

1) Superintendent prepares self-evaluation, compiles evidence and provides to Board of Education.
2) Board members seek clarity, as needed, regarding self-evaluation or evidence provided.
3) Board of Education members receive blank evaluation instrument and make individual notes about their observations.

During meeting:

4) Superintendent presents self-evaluation and evidence. Superintendent remains present throughout the meeting.
5) Board president or Facilitator reviews with Board of Education superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates conversation about performance.
6) Score is assigned for each performance indicator via consensus of the Board of Education.
7) Upon completion of all performance indicators within all domains, the tool will calculate the overall professional practice score and identify the correlating rating.
8) The Board of Education reviews evidence provided related to progress toward district-wide goals and assigns a score via consensus.
9) The Board of Education reviews evidence provided related to the District Student Growth Model and assigns a score via consensus.
10) The tool will calculate the overall evaluation score based on professional practice, progress toward district-wide improvement goals and student growth ratings.
11) The Board President or Facilitator makes note of themes/trends identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
12) The Board reconvenes in open session if they have done the evaluation in closed session
13) Board president calls for vote to adopt completed year-end evaluation for superintendent.
14) After approval of the evaluation, the Superintendent notes their comments on evaluation if desired.
15) Board president and superintendent sign completed evaluation form and it goes into the personnel file and the overall rating is reported in the REP.

Appendix D – *Considerations Related to the Closed Meeting*

The Board of Education may go into closed session for certain aspects of the superintendent's evaluation but ONLY at the request of the superintendent. A superintendent who has requested a closed session may rescind the request at any time. The following table identifies which aspects of the process need to be in open and closed session:

OPEN PHASE
Scheduling the evaluation
Choosing and modifying the evaluation instrument
Establishing performance goals or expectations
Determining process for the evaluation
Voting to go into closed session

CLOSED PHASE ***only if requested by employee***
Discuss & deliberate about evaluation/performance of the superintendent

OPEN PHASE
Adoption of the evaluation
Related board actions and discussions

Consensus That Involves a Closed Session

1. Superintendent requests a closed session for the purpose of their evaluation.
2. Board of Education votes to go into closed session.
3. Board of Education moves into closed session: the superintendent remains present throughout the session unless they choose to excuse themself.
4. Board president or facilitator reviews with the Board of Education the superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates a conversation about performance. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for each domain score.
5. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress towards district-wide goals. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for progress towards district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education.
6. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for student growth.
7. Upon completion of all areas, the tool will calculate the overall score and identify the correlating rating.
8. Board president or facilitator makes a note of themes that were identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
9. **Board of Education comes out of Closed Session and returns to an Open Meeting.**
10. Board president asks for a motion to approve the evaluation (since the work was completed in closed session, it is confidential until approved by the Board). Once approved by the Board:
    - The consensus score/rating for the overall evaluation can be identified and a public statement can be announced.
11. Superintendent notes their comments on the evaluation, if desired.
12. Board president and superintendent sign the completed evaluation form.
13. Board president works with the superintendent to coordinate further public statement about the superintendent's performance if needed.

The completed evaluation form reflects the Board of Education's assessment of the superintendent's performance and is subject to FOIA.
The forms used by individual board members for notes are not subject to FOIA providing they are not calculated into an average score.

Appendix E – *Possible Timelines for Evaluation of the Superintendent*

Key dates and deliverables for superintendent evaluation should be mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent at the *beginning* of the evaluation cycle. Timeline scenarios and key benchmark descriptions are provided below.

January – December		June – July		March – April	
Activity	**Month**	**Activity**	**Month**	**Activity**	**Month**
Tool, process, timeline and goals mutually established	January	Tool, process, timeline and goals mutually established	July	Tool, process, timeline and goals mutually established	May
Informal update	April	Informal update	October	Informal update	August
Mandatory Mid-year Progress Report	June	Mandatory Mid-year Progress Report	December	Mandatory Mid-year Progress Report	October
Informal update	August	Informal update	February	Informal update	December
Annual evaluation	November	Annual evaluation	May	Annual evaluation	March
Advantage: Aligns with election cycle. Board members who establish goals are likely the same board members evaluating performance.		**Advantage:** Aligns with the school year. Is compatible with natural flow of the school year as well as hiring cycle for most superintendents.		**Advantage:** Aligns with contract renewal cycle in many cases. Boards of Education must provide superintendents 90 days' notice in the event of nonrenewal of contract.	

Beginning of Cycle	**Informal Update**	**Mid-cycle Formal Update**	**Annual Evaluation**
Board of Education and superintendent mutually agree upon: • System (tool) to be used • Timeline and key dates • Goals, benchmarks and evidence • How evaluation will be compiled • How evaluation will be shared with superintendent • How evaluation will be shared with the community	• Board president shares any specific questions or concerns from board members • Superintendent provides a written update to the board on goals, expectations and indicators of success • Board offers input on status/progress to-date	• Board president provides questions from the board prior to meeting • Superintendent provides update on progress with available evidence • Board seeks clarification if needed • Discussion on progress and growth • Adjustments to course or goals are discussed	• Superintendent performs self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education • Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation, seek clarification as needed • Board president or consultant facilitate evaluation • Formal evaluation is presented to and adopted by Board of Education • Board president and superintendent coordinate public statement regarding superintendent performance

Appendix F – *Establishing Performance Goals for the Superintendent*

The MASB Superintendent Evaluation instrument provides a framework for evaluating the superintendent in critical areas of professional practice as well as the state-required components of student growth and progress towards district-wide goals. Additional performance goals should be established in exceptional circumstances to clarify the board's expectations and give priority to the work being done. For this reason, performance goals should be limited in number, aligned to district goals and assist in clarifying accountability.

Superintendent performance goals may be developed from:

- A specific district goal
- A job performance indicator within an evaluation instrument
- Student performance data

When establishing performance goals, the following guidelines should be considered:

- Involve all board members and superintendent
- Decide on desired results
- Develop performance indicators
- Identify supporting documentation (evidence)
- Review and approve final performance goals, indicators and evidence
- Monitor progress at scheduled checkpoints

Performance Goal Fundamentals

Performance goals should be S-M-A-R-T:
Specific – Goals should be simplistically written and clearly define what is expected.
Measurable – Goals should be measurable and their attainment evidenced in some tangible way.
Achievable – Goals should be achievable given the circumstances and resources at hand.
Results-focused – Goals should measure outcomes not activities.
Time-related – Goals should be linked to a specific timeframe.

Process for Goal Development

1. Identify the district goal/priority/indicator/student performance data the superintendent's goal is intended to support
2. Ask the superintendent:
   a. What will we see next year toward the accomplishment of this that we don't see now?
   b. What measure will we use to know that the difference represents meaningful progress?
3. Allow superintendent time to craft a response
4. Once agreed upon, board and superintendent develop SMART goal statements

Appendix G – *Evidence*

Validity, reliability and efficacy of the MASB Superintendent Evaluation Instrument relies upon board members using evidence to score superintendent performance.

- Artifacts to serve as evidence of superintendent performance should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent.
- Artifacts should be limited to only what is needed to inform scoring superintendent performance. Excessive artifacts cloud the evaluation process and waste precious time and resources.
- Boards of Education and superintendents should establish when artifacts are to be provided, i.e., as they originate, at designated checkpoints, during self-evaluation, etc.

A list of possible artifacts that may be used as evidence is provided at the end of each professional practice domain rubric. See the appendixes of this document for additional artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance.

Appendix H – *Possible Evidence of Performance*

Evidence helps to demonstrate performance of the superintendent and remove guess work and subjectivity from evaluation. The following artifacts may be used as evidence of performance. This list is not comprehensive.

1 Administrative "calendar" – critical dates calendar (RE: due dates, etc.) and board presentation cycle/annual reports
2 Administrative team book study (agendas and minutes)
3 Administrative team meeting agendas
4 Affirmative action plan
5 Agendas and/or minutes from community planning meetings, including key communicators meetings
6 Auditor's report
7 Background checks verification
8 Board and administrative goals
9 Board meeting agendas
10 Board policy and administrative policy enforcement that's reflective of a "new" vision with supporting materials
11 Bullying/harassment programs
12 Character education program data
13 Civic group presentations
14 Collaboration/sharing incentives/opportunities for efficiency/effective learning (documentation)
15 Collaborative partners (documentation)
16 Collaborative sharing of programs, etc. (agendas and minutes)
17 Common teacher instructional planning time
18 Communication "vehicles" that make the school vision visible to stakeholders including using technology
19 Communications with parents
20 Community survey
21 Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
22 Customer satisfaction indices
23 Curriculum team meeting agendas
24 Curriculum and instructional audit
25 Data on outreach programs
26 Department of Education site visit summative report
27 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Data
28 Development of wikis, blogs, etc., to collect feedback on specific issues in the district
29 District Budget
30 District-wide School Improvement Plan
31 Distribution of research to administrative team and teachers
32 Diversity training/awareness plan
33 Documentation of coaching for instruction, curriculum or assessment
34 Documentation of coaching and evaluation of principals
35 Economic vision (participation with community development groups)
36 Election results that impact tax levies
37 Emergency/Crisis Plans
38 Employee handbooks
39 Enrollment plans
40 Equity district-wide program results
41 Evidence of annual review of district's mission statement and alignment to practice
42 Evidence of implementation of formal project management techniques
43 Evidence of relationship building (notes, cards, emails, etc.)
44 Evidence of teachers examining student achievement data
45 Feedback from a wide variety of stakeholders about performance as the superintendent
46 Formal and informal community partnership agreements and plans
47 Formative assessments to inform instruction
48 Grants received/applied for – alignment to goals of the district; sustainability
49 Growth goals for administrators
50 Hiring process (guidelines, procedures, schedules)
51 House calls – contact with parents and partners (documentation)
52 Induction plan of board members for understanding of school finance (confidence of board members' understanding)
53 Involvement with "school safety" organizations (documentation)
54 Instructional model
55 Instruction-related professional development/growth plans
56 iPod audible book study
57 Job-embedded PD on instruction

Appendix H – Possible Evidence of Performance, continued

58 Leadership library (documentation)
59 Level of volunteerism (documentation)
60 Linkage of Professional Development Model to student achievement goals (documentation)
61 Log of school visits and conversations with staff (includes emails)
62 Log of school visits and presentations
63 Meaningful interpretive reports of student achievement data delivered in lay language
64 Media – Newsletter/paper articles/Web site
65 Meeting logs of times with administrative staff/support staff
66 Membership and service to service clubs (documentation)
67 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress Data
68 Michigan Top-to-Bottom School Rankings
69 Minutes of the School Improvement Advisory Committee meetings
70 Monthly calendars
71 National Assessment of Educational Progress Data
72 Needs assessments/satisfaction surveys/focus groups
73 Notes from state officials
74 Number of visits to website
75 Observational data from board, staff, etc.
76 Open houses (documentation)
77 Opening day PowerPoint-type presentation
78 Parenting classes - numbers
79 Parent-teacher conference numbers
80 Participation in social/fraternal organizations (documentation)
81 Participation in youth-oriented organizations (documentation)
82 Participation on state, regional, national initiatives (documentation)
83 PBS – Positive Behavior Supports – control/theory/SAFE/Olweus/CHAMPS implementation plans
84 Podcasts/video communicating district vision and accomplishments
85 Policies/procedures for management of funds
86 Preschool – community partnership plans
87 Presentations to groups, including teachers (shareholders/stakeholders)
88 Professional Development Plan
89 Program evaluation and process result
90 Reflective journals
91 Record of solicitation of feedback
92 Reports and celebrations of student achievement to board and other audiences
93 School comparisons charts from CEPI
94 Special Education delivery plan
95 Staff handbook
96 School Improvement Plans
97 Staff recruitment plan
98 Student achievement data
99 Surveys of staff/community
100 Symbolic “pins,” other symbols – celebrations, etc.
101 Teacher mentor program
102 Trends in Career Development Plan growth goals for teachers
103 Work with city council on city/school initiatives (documentation)
104 Work with School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC) (documentation)
105 Written communications
106 Written proposals for innovative practices
107 Written recommendations on difficult issues

Appendix I – *Contingencies*

If a superintendent receives a rating of **developing** or **needing support**, the Board of Education must develop and require the superintendent to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan must recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the superintendent on their next annual evaluation. See the appendixes of this document for more information on developing an Individual Improvement Plan for the superintendent.

If a superintendent receives a rating of **effective** on three consecutive annual evaluations, the Board of Education may choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a superintendent is not rated as effective on one of these biennial evaluations, the superintendent must again be evaluated annually.

Appendix J – *Student growth and assessment data or student learning objectives metrics*

For all superintendents, the evaluation system has to take into account multiple measures of student growth and assessment data. For superintendents who are *regularly involved in instructional matters* —and this includes all but the most exceptional situations—the following specific expectations must be met with regard to student growth and assessment data or student learning objectives metrics :

> **Beginning in the 2024-2025 school year, 20% of the year-end evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data or student learning objectives metrics.**

Student growth and assessment data used for superintendent evaluation may be the combined student growth and assessment data used in teacher annual year-end evaluations for the entire district.

Student Growth Versus Student Achievement

Student growth and student achievement are not the same measurement. Student achievement is a single measurement of student performance while student growth measures the amount of students' academic progress between two points in time. [1]

> Student Achievement Example: A student could score 350 on a math assessment.
>
> Student Growth Example: A student could show a 50-point growth by improving their math score from 300 last year in the fourth grade to 350 on this year's fifth grade exam.

It's important to note that, in order to measure student growth, the data considered must be from a single group of students, i.e., this year's fourth graders and next year's fifth graders.

What is a Student Growth Model?

School districts should establish a student growth model to be used in educator and administrator evaluations. A growth model is a collection of definitions, calculations or rules that summarizes student performance over two or more time points and supports interpretations about students, their classrooms, their educators or their schools. [2]

Michigan law requires that multiple research-based growth and assessment or student learning objective metrics be used in student growth models that are used for evaluation purposes. This may include state assessments, alternative assessments, student learning objectives, nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on individualized program goals.

1 Measuring student growth: A guide to informed decision making, Center for Public Education
2 A Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models, Council of Chief State School Officers

Appendix K – *Developing an Individual Improvement Plan for the Superintendent*

Individual Improvement Plans are an excellent way of helping employees develop their skills. Boards of education should encourage superintendents to develop an IIP in order to foster professional development.

In the event that a superintendent receives a rating that is less than effective, the law requires the creation of an IIP. The following process is a framework for creating and implementing an IIP for the superintendent.

- During the evaluation conference, the Board of Education provides clear feedback to the superintendent in the domain(s) in which they received a less than effective rating.
- A committee of the Board of Education is established to support and monitor the superintendent's development.
- The superintendent drafts an Improvement Plan and presents it to the committee for feedback and approval. The Improvement Plan outlines clear growth objectives, as well as the training and development activities in which the superintendent will engage to accomplish objectives. The committee reviews, provides feedback and approves the Improvement Plan.
- The committee meets quarterly with the superintendent to monitor and discuss progress.
- The superintendent reports progress on their Improvement Plan with their self-evaluation prior to the formal annual evaluation.

Appendix L – *Training*

MASB provides training on its Superintendent Evaluation instrument to board members and superintendents via a cadre of certified trainers. Training is as follows:

Instrument-Specific Training/Rater Reliability Training

This training covers the use of the MASB Superintendent Evaluation instrument including the cycle and processes of evaluation, rating superintendent performance on the rubric, rater reliability training, as well as the use of evidence to evaluate superintendent performance. This training fulfills the requirement of evaluator training for board members as well as evaluatee training for superintendents whose districts are evaluating their superintendent with the MASB Superintendent Evaluation instrument. It is conducted on-location in districts with board members and superintendent present.

Authors

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

MASB staff and faculty involved in creating the MASB Superintendent Evaluation instrument Include:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), East China School District
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Donna Oser, CAE, Director of Executive Search and Leadership Development, MASB
- Debbie Stair, M.N.M.L., former school board member, Assistant Director of Leadership Development, MASB
- Jay Bennett, M.A., former school board member, Assistant Director of Executive Search Services, MASB

New York Council of School Superintendents staff and leadership involved in creating the Council's Superintendent Model Evaluation (which significantly influenced MASB's instrument):

- Jacinda H. Conboy, Esq., New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Sharon L. Contreras, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City SD
- Chad C. Groff, Superintendent of Schools
- Robert J. Reidy, Executive Director, New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Maria C. Rice, Superintendent of Schools, New Paltz CSD
- Dawn A. Santiago-Marullo, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Victor CSD
- Randall W. Squier, CAS, Superintendent of Schools, Coxsackie-Athens CSD
- Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent of Schools (retired), Marion CSD